

REED SMITH LLP

A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware

Colleen T. Davies (SBN 111371)  
Email: cdavies@reedsmith.com  
Steven J. Boranian (SBN 174183)  
Email: sboranian@reedsmith.com  
Karen A. Braje (SBN 193900)  
Email: kbraje@reedsmith.com  
Alison B. Riddell (SBN 246120)  
Email: ariddell@reedsmith.com  
REED SMITH LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3922

**Mailing Address:**  
P.O. Box 7936  
San Francisco, CA 94120-7936  
  
Telephone: +1 415 543 8700  
Facsimile: +1 415 391 8269

Attorneys for Defendants  
Merck & Co., Inc. and  
Schering-Plough Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD HASKIN, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MERCK & CO., INC. and SCHERING-  
PLOUGH CORP.,

Defendants.

No.: C 08-0376 SI

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER  
TRANSFERRING CASES**

Compl. Filed: January 22, 2008  
Trial Date: None set  
Disc. Cut-Off: None set

Honorable Susan Illston

1 In accordance with the Court's prior Order, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 8, 2008,  
2 the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ruled on the pending motions for centralization and  
3 transfer in *In re Vytarin/Zetia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL  
4 No. 1938. The Panel decided that the 33 actions which were the subject of the motion should be  
5 centralized and transferred to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A copy  
6 of the Panel Order is attached to this Notice. This action is one of the cases transferred under the  
7 Panel Order. *See* Order, Exh. A.

8  
9 DATED: April 11, 2008.

10 REED SMITH LLP

11  
12 By /s/ Steven J. Boranian  
13 Steven J. Boranian  
14 Attorneys for Defendants  
15 Merck & Co., Inc. and  
16 Schering-Plough Corporation

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
DOCSSFO-12511601

REED SMITH LLP  
A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware

UNITED STATES  
JUDICIAL PANEL ON  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**Apr 08, 2008**

FILED  
CLERK'S OFFICE

**IN RE: VYTORIN/ZETIA MARKETING, SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY  
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1938

**TRANSFER ORDER**

**Before the entire Panel<sup>\*</sup>:** Plaintiffs in eleven actions have submitted five motions,<sup>1</sup> pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, for centralization of a total of 33 actions. No responding party opposes centralization, but there is disagreement over the selection of a transferee forum. Moving and responding plaintiffs variously support centralization in the following districts: the Northern District of California, the District of Colorado, the Middle District of Florida, the Eastern District of Louisiana, the District of Minnesota, the Southern District of Mississippi, the Eastern or Western District of Missouri, the District of New Jersey, the Southern District of New York, or the Northern District of Ohio. Responding defendants<sup>2</sup> support centralization in the District of New Jersey.

This litigation currently consists of 33 actions listed on Schedule A and pending in seventeen districts as follows: twelve actions in the District of New Jersey, three actions in the Northern District of California, two actions each in the District of Kansas, the Northern District of Mississippi, the Southern District of New York, and the Northern District of Ohio, and one action each in the Eastern District of California, the District of Colorado, the Middle District of Florida, the Southern District of Florida, the Eastern District of Louisiana, the District of Minnesota, the Eastern District of New York, the Southern District of Ohio, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the District of Puerto Rico.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>\*</sup> Judges Heyburn, Motz and Scirica did not participate in the disposition of this matter.

<sup>1</sup> Although additional submissions styled as "motions" were submitted to the Panel, they were docketed as responses in accordance with Panel Rule 7.2(h). *See* Rule 7.2(h), R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 434 (2001).

<sup>2</sup> Merck/Schering-Plough Pharmaceuticals; Merck & Co., Inc. (Merck); Schering-Plough Corp. (Schering-Plough); Schering Corp.; Schering-Plough Biopharma; Schering-Plough Healthcare Products, Inc.; Schering-Plough Healthcare Products Sales Corp.; Merck Sharp & Dohme (Italia) S.P.A.; MSP Singapore Co., LLC; and MSP Technology Singapore PTE, Ltd.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to the 33 actions now before the Panel, the parties have notified the Panel of 67 related actions pending in various districts across the country. These actions and any other related actions



-2-

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, we find that these 33 actions involve common questions of fact, and that centralization under Section 1407 in the District of New Jersey will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. All actions share factual questions concerning allegations relating to the use and/or marketing of the drugs Vytorin and/or Zetia. Centralization under Section 1407 will eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, including those with respect to certification of class actions; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary.

We are persuaded that the District of New Jersey is an appropriate transferee forum for this litigation. Because Merck and Schering-Plough have their corporate headquarters within the District of New Jersey, relevant discovery may be found there. In addition, transfer to this district enjoys the support of defendants and several plaintiffs.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the actions listed on Schedule A and pending outside the District of New Jersey are transferred to the District of New Jersey and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Dennis M. Cavanaugh for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings with the actions pending there and listed on Schedule A.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



---

D. Lowell Jensen  
Acting Chairman

John G. Heyburn II, Chairman\*  
Robert L. Miller, Jr.  
David R. Hansen

J. Frederick Motz\*  
Kathryn H. Vratil  
Anthony J. Scirica\*

---

will be treated as potential tag-along actions. *See* Rules 7.4 and 7.5, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001).

**IN RE: VYTORIN/ZETIA MARKETING, SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY  
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1938

**SCHEDULE A**

Eastern District of California

George Artenstein v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-152

Northern District of California

Richard Haskin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-376  
ASEA/AFSCME Local 52 Health Benefits Trust, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al.,  
C.A. No. 3:08-531  
Helen Aronis v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:08-352

District of Colorado

Ronna Dee Kitsmiller, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-120

Middle District of Florida

Marion J. Greene v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-69

Southern District of Florida

Sam A. Ciotti v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:08-60077

District of Kansas

Charles Swanson, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-2040  
John P. Dudley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 6:08-1027

Eastern District of Louisiana

RoseAnn S. Flores v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-674

- A2 -

**MDL No. 1938 Schedule A (Continued)**

District of Minnesota

Jody Fischer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:08-203

Northern District of Mississippi

Susan McCulley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-16

Lisa Mims v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:08-10

District of New Jersey

Rita Polk v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-285

Jay Klitzner v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-316

Sandra Weiss v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-320

Lionel Galperin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-349

Robert J. McGarry v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-350

Charles D. Maurer, et al. v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-393

Daniel A. Brown v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-395

Steven Knight v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-396

Ken W. Bever v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-430

David DeAngelis v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-431

Ciro Verdi, et al. v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-432

Marilyn Woodman v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-437

Eastern District of New York

Sigmond Tomaszewski v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-258

Southern District of New York

Joyce B. Rheingold, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-438

Stanley Levy, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-491

Northern District of Ohio

Theodore Sahley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-153

Panayiotis Balaouras v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-198

- A3 -

**MDL No. 1938 Schedule A (Continued)**

Southern District of Ohio

Dennis Kean v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-61

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Fred Singer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-331

District of Puerto Rico

Alexis Alicea-Figueroa, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-1099